

REMARKS

Claims 1-14, 16-17, and 19-29 are pending in this application with claims 1-3, 7, 11, and 19-22 being independent. Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 10-12, 14, 19-22, and 26-29 are amended by virtue of this response, as discussed in more detail below. No new matter has been added.

Regarding preliminary matters, the Office Action states in paragraph 1 that the IDS filed March 4, 2004 (*sic*, May 5, 2004) fails to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.98(a)(2), "which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent (and) publication..." Applicant respectfully points out that 37 C.F.R. 1.98(a)(2)(ii) states that an IDS must include, with emphasis added, "Each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed, other than U.S. patents and U.S. patent application publications unless required by the Office." Therefore, since the IDS of May 5, 2004 included only U.S. Patents and a U.S. Publication, Applicant submits that no copies were necessary, and that the IDS was proper. Therefore, Applicant requests the return of an initialed copy of the associated Form PTO-1449, indicating consideration of the listed references.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-10, 16, 19-23, 25-27, and 29 are allowed. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating the presence of allowable subject matter in these claims. Further, Applicant submits that the amendments to claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10, 19-22, 26, 27, and 29 are for clarification purposes, and does not believe that the amendments alter or affect allowability thereof.

Claims 2, 5, 11-14 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112(2) as being indefinite. The above-mentioned amendments to claims 2, 11, 12, 14, and 24 are made in view of these rejections, and are believed to fully address the rejections. Accordingly, Applicant requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 5, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,486,864 to Nakajima et al. (Nakajima). Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,774,100 to Aoki et al. (Aoki) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0017610 to Ozawa (Ozawa). Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki in view of Ozawa, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,177,920 to Koyama et al. (Koyama). Claims 17 and 28 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki in view of Ozawa, and further in view of Nakajima.

Regarding the above-listed rejections, Applicant submits that the above-mentioned claim amendments to claims 2, 11, 12, 14, and 28 serve to clarify Applicant's claims in a manner that illustrates their distinguishing features with respect to the cited references, as discussed in more detail below. As with allowed and amended claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10, 19-22, 26, 27, and 29, the amendments are not believed or intended to affect a scope of the claims.

Regarding the rejection of claims 2, 5, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nakajima, Applicant respectfully submits that Nakajima does not disclose or properly suggest all of the limitations of at least independent claim 2, as amended.

Specifically, independent claim 2 recites (with emphasis added): A method of driving a liquid crystal display device comprising a step of simultaneously applying a common signal voltage to a plurality of pixel electrodes of a plurality of pixels connected to a signal line, thereby displaying a common gray-scale among the plurality of pixels connected to the signal line."

Applicant submits that Nakajima does not disclose or properly suggest a method in which a common signal voltage is supplied to a plurality of pixel electrodes of a plurality of pixels connected to a signal line, thereby displaying a common gray-scale among the plurality of pixels connected to the signal line. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 2, as well as dependent claims 5 and 24, are allowable for at least this reason.

Regarding the rejection of claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki in view of Ozawa, Applicant respectfully submits that no proper combination of these references teaches all of the features of independent claim 11. For example, claim 11 recites a liquid crystal display device that includes, with emphasis added,

a plurality of pixels;
a plurality of pixel electrodes included in the pixels
respectively;
a first means for detecting pixels which are connected to the same signal line and which are to be applied with a common signal voltage for displaying a common gray-scale among the pixels, from all of the pixels; and

Applicant : Rumo Satake
Serial No. : 09/966,354
Filed : September 27, 2001
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 07977-285001 / US5238

a second means for simultaneously applying the common
signal voltage to pixel electrodes of the detected pixels.


Applicant submits that neither Aoki nor Ozawa, nor any proper combination of the two,
discloses at least the above-emphasized claim limitations, so that independent claim 11 (as well
as dependent claims 12-14, 17, and 28), is allowable for at least this reason.

Based on the above, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such
action is hereby requested in the Examiner's next official communication.

Enclosed is a \$790.00 check for the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) fee.
Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 8, 2004



William G. Hughes, Jr.
Reg. No. 46,112

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331